

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-38 were pending of which Claims 1-6, 12-30, and 36-38 were rejected and Claims 7-11 and 31-35 were objected to. Claims 1, 7, 10, 16, 27, 31 and 34 have been amended and new Claims 39-44 have been added.

The Examiner objected to Claims 7-11 and 31 to 35 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to include some of the limitations of Claim 7, Claim 27 has been amended to include some of the limitations of Claim 31, New Claims 39, 41, and 42, and 47 include the limitations of original Claims 1 and 9, 1 and 11, 27 and 33, and 27 and 35, respectively. Thus, the scope of Claims 1 and 27 have not been narrowed as compared to original Claims 7 and 31, respectively. Similarly, the scope of Claims 39, 41, 42, and 44 have not been narrowed as compared to original claims 9, 11, 33, and 35, respectively

Summary of Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to include some of the limitations of Claim 7. This amendment is supported by at least original Claims 1 and 7.

Claim 7 has been amended to remove the limitation that was included in amended Claim 1. This amendment is supported by at least original Claims 1 and 7.

Claim 10 has been amended to more properly depend from Claim 9. This amendment is supported by at least original Claims 1, 9, and 10.

Claim 16 has been amended to include a means plus limitation based on original Claim 7. This amendment is supported by at least original Claim 1, 7, and 16.

Claim 27 has been amended to include some of the limitations of Claim 31. This amendment is supported by at least original Claims 27 and 31.

Claim 31 has been amended to remove the limitation that was included in amended Claim 27. This amendment is supported by at least original Claims 27 and 31.

Claim 34 has been amended to more properly depend from Claim 33. This amendment is supported by at least original Claims 27, 33, and 34.

New Claims

New Claim 39 combines the limitations of original Claims 1 and 9 and is thus supported by original Claims 1 and 9.

New Claim 40, which depends from Claim 39 is equivalent to original Claim 10 and is thus supported by Original Claim 10.

New Claim 41 combines the limitations of original Claims 1 and 11 and is thus supported by original Claims 1 and 11.

New Claim 42 combines the limitations of original Claims 27 and 33 and is thus supported by original Claims 27 and 33.

New Claim 43, which depends from Claim 42 is equivalent to original Claim 34 and is thus supported by Original Claim 34.

New Claim 44 combines the limitations of original Claims 27 and 35 and is thus supported by original Claims 24 and 35.

No new matter has been added in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4, 13, and 16-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Adams et al. (6,700,622). However the Examiner also stated that "Claims 7-11, 31-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim."

Original claim 7 includes two limitations. The Examiner did not state specifically state why Claim 7 is allowable. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Adams et al. does not teach or suggest "incrementing an enter special mode counter when the selected special pattern is detected" as recited in original Claim 7. Therefore, amended Claim 1 has been amended to include this limitation from original Claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 is allowable, and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-15, which depend from Claim 1, are also allowable.

Similarly, Claim 16 has been amended to recite "wherein the mode detector further comprises a special mode counter configured to increment when a special pattern in the input interlaced video stream is detected". Applicants respectfully submit that that Adams et al. does not teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 16 is allowable, and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 16. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 17-26, which depend from Claim 16, are also allowable.

Claim 27 has been amended to recite "means for incrementing an enter special mode counter when the selected special pattern is detected", a limitation in original Claim 33. Applicants

respectfully submit that that Adams et al. does not teach or suggest "means for incrementing an enter special mode counter when the selected special pattern is detected". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 27 is allowable, and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 27. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 28-38, which depend from Claim 27, are also allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, and 36-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. (6,700,622). Applicants respectfully submit that due to the amendment of the independent claims from which the rejected claims depend, the rejection of Claims 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, and 36-38 has been rendered moot. For the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, and 36-38.

New Claims

Independent Claim 39 includes the limitations of original Claims 1 and 9. Independent Claim 41, includes the limitations of original Claims 1 and 11. Independent Claim 42 includes the limitations of Claims 27 and 33. Independent Claim 44 includes the limitations of Claims 27 and 35. The Examiner has stated that "Claims 7-11, 31-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim." Because Claims 39, 41, 42 and 44 are rewritten claims in independent form that include the

limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 39, 41, 42 and 44 are allowable. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 40, which depend from Claim 39, and Claim 43, which depends from Claim 42 are likewise allowable.

Conclusion

Claims 1, 7, 10, 16, 27, 31, and 34 have been amended and Claims 39-44 have been added. Thus Claims 1-44 are pending. For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1-44. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 857-0559.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Mao

Edward S. Mao
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,713

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY "FIRST CLASS"

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the below date.

Edward Mao

Edward S. Mao

July 28, 2006

Date

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP

10 Mission College Blvd
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210